

REMARKS

The Pending Claims

Claims 3, 6, 7, 10-13, and 17-20 have been amended, and claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 14-16 have been canceled. Thus, claims 3, 6-13, and 17-20 currently are pending in the application.

Summary of the Office Action

The Office Action rejects claims 5 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claims the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4, 14, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,666,477 (Robertson et al.) (hereinafter “the Robertson ‘477 patent”).

The Office Action acknowledges that claims 3, 6-13, and 17-20 recite subject matter that is allowable over the cited prior art, but objects to the claims insofar as they depend from a rejected base claim.

Discussion of the Section 112, Second Paragraph, Rejections

Claims 5 and 16 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Therefore, the Section 112, second paragraph, rejections have been rendered moot and should be withdrawn.

Discussion of the Section 103 Rejection

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 14-16 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Therefore, the Section 103 rejections of these claims have been rendered moot and should be withdrawn.

The remaining claims (i.e., claims 3, 6-13, and 17-20), which the Office Action acknowledges as reciting subject matter that is allowable over the cited references, have been rewritten in independent form or amended to depend from a claim that the Office Action indicates as reciting allowable subject matter.

Furthermore, as acknowledged by the Office Action, the Robertson ‘477 patent does not appear to disclose a method of making a side curtain airbag by weaving a side curtain airbag fabric according to a pattern such that the longest straight side of the pattern is oriented in a bias direction with respect to the warp of

the fabric. Rather, the Robertson '477 patent describes a process for producing a cushion by folding and seaming a textile fabric blank (see, e.g., the Robertson '477 patent at col. 2, lines 35-38). Producing a cushion via such folding and seaming of a textile blank is fundamentally different from the method of weaving a complete airbag described in the current specification, depicted in the present drawings, and recited in the pending claims. Indeed, the present specification, drawings, and claims clearly indicate that, in the present method, a complete airbag is produced during the weaving process and the only remaining step is to cut the complete, woven airbag from the fabric produced on the loom.

Thus, the pending claims (i.e., claims 3, 6-13, and 17-20) recite subject matter that is patentable over the cited references, and the claim objections should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the application is considered in proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone interview would expedite prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.



Robert M. Lanning
Reg. No. 57,121
MILLIKEN & COMPANY, M-495
P.O. Box 1926
Spartanburg, SC 29304
Telephone: (864) 503-1537
Facsimile: (864) 503-1999

Date: July 22, 2005